

Agenda 5/25/11 DEQ/EPA Source Control Integration into PH ROD

Purpose of Mtg

- 1) Discuss schedule for ROD & possible forms of ROD
- 2) Discuss how upland source control will be integrated into PH ROD

Desired Outcomes of Mtg

- 1) Gain better shared understanding of integrating source control into ROD
- 2) Define “Next Steps”

Assumptions

- 1) PH ROD (discussion lead by EPA)
 - Schedule for ROD- late-2013 or 2014
 - Form of ROD- comprehensive..., interim..., sequential..., partial..., etc???
 - EPA’s realistic vision of acceptable source control-
 - SMA/AOPC-specific recontamination potential analyses in RD- Who does this (in-water RP?)..., who’s the lead agency..., when is this done?
 - Guidance & examples- EPA “ROD Guidance”..., Puget Sound RODs????
- 2) PH Upland Source Control (discussion led by DEQ)
 - Status of source control at ROD
 - High Priority Sites**-
 - Medium Priority Sites**-
 - Low Priority Sites**-
 - Contaminant migration pathways
 - Groundwater**-
 - Stormwater/waste water**-
 - Bank erosion**-
 - Overland runoff**-
 - Overwater releases**-
 - Airborne deposition to river**-

Discussion

- 1) PH Proposed Plan/ROD- how will source control be integrated into each document?
- 2) PH Upland Source Control

Next Steps

- 1) What documentation is needed for PP & ROD..., when?

Talking Points- 5/25/11 DEQ/EPA SW SC/ROD Mtg

4/8/10 DEQ/EPA/City SW SC Mtg

-EPA's vision of a SC "Companion Document" to the PH ROD

- Current status of SC
- Strategy/plan for achieving SC
- Potential for recontamination
 - What are the controlled sources?
 - What are the sources currently doing source control work?
 - What is the potential for currently unidentified, significant sources?
- Timeline for achieving SC & implementing remaining elements of overall strategy (e.g., SW permits)
- How is SC Strategy designed to accommodate the unexpected (e.g., unexpected recontamination..., currently unidentified significant source)
- Should be finalized & accepted by EPA shortly after draft FS is submitted

DEQ's PH SW SC Strategy

- Both the status & preliminary strategy of SW SC were presented as a stand-alone document attached to the 9/10 PH Milestone Report
- EPA wants the PH SW SC strategy to include: 1) relative importance of SW pathway..., 2) what DEQ's accomplished in SW SC (discovery, evaluation, control)..., 3) what needs to be done..., 4) decision tree..., & 5) short-term & long-term plans for SW SC

Recontamination Potential Analysis (RPA)

- 3 separate efforts:
 - 1) DEQ using SEDCAM
 - 2) LWH using Hybrid Model
 - 3) EPA???
- EPA stressed the RPA is important..., but it's a model. What's most important is Performance Monitoring to verify model predictions
- EPA stresses if we're planning on doing Performance Monitoring..., we need to start soon to establish baseline conditions

Status of Source Control at ROD

-High Priority Sites-

- Current number of High Priority Sites- 15
- Sites anticipated to have SC completed by PH ROD or shortly after- 15/15
- Questionable sites- 5/15 (City OFs, PEO, Gasco, Arkema, Gunderson)
- Sites with interim SCMs in place- 11/15
- Sites where SW is only remaining pathway in SCE- 5/15

-Medium Priority Sites-

- Current number of Medium Priority Sites- 28
- Sites anticipated to have SC completed by PH ROD or shortly after- all 28/28
- Questionable sites- 4/28 (Shore Terminal, GS Roofing, Glacier NW (RM 11E), Cargill)
- Sites with interim SCMs in place- 16/28
- Sites where SW is only remaining pathway in SCE- 4/28

-Low Priority Sites-

- Current number of Low- 24
- Sites anticipated to have SC completed by PH ROD or shortly after- all 24/24
- Questionable sites- 0/24
- Sites with interim SCMs in place- 15/24
- Sites where SW is only remaining pathway in SCE- 6/24

Contaminant Migration Pathways

-Groundwater-

-Qualitative evaluation-

- GW contamination is a significant threat at only a handful of sites. These are the sites we're focusing. Most of these significant sites have interim SCMs in place.
- A number of other sites have GW plumes that exceed SLVs (ARARs), but don't appear to pose a significant threat of recontamination. DEQ will continue to consider these sites, but they are not our highest priority.

-Sites posing significant threat of recontamination-

- 11 (PEO, KM Linnton, Arco/BP, Exxon/Mobil, Gasco, Gasco MGP waste at Siltronic, Siltronic TCE, Rhone Poulenc, Arkema, Willbridge, Gunderson)
- 8/11 have interim GW SCM in place

-Stormwater/waste water-

-Qualitative Evaluation

- SW pathway is common & not trivial..., but it's uncertain what threat (load) SW discharges to river
- SW pathway will never be eliminated..., & will always contain some amount of contamination

-DEQ PH SW Strategy

- See 9/10 "Update on SW SC"

-Status of PH SW SC

- SW SCE are needed or ongoing at >75 sites
- SW SCDs have been issues at 16 sites, & DEQ considers SW to be an insignificant or incomplete pathway at >50 sites

-Next steps

- Complete PH SW Strategy (fall 2011)
- Continue SCE/BMPs/SCMs at PH sites
- Complete loading & RPA

-Bank erosion-

-Qualitative Evaluation

- Bank erosion pathway is common & not trivial
- Only a handful of sites have or will have adequate SCE &/or SCM completed by the ROD for this pathway. Our strategy has been to defer bank erosion work at many sites to RD for the in-water work to be done after the ROD. This will better integrate the in-water & any river-bank work that needs to be done.

-Overland runoff-

-Qualitative Evaluation

- Uncommon pathway. Most overland runoff is captured by stormwater conveyance systems

-Overwater releases-

-Qualitative Evaluation

- Uncommon pathway & pathway that doesn't fit very well into SC

-Airborne deposition to river-

-Qualitative Evaluation

- Airborne deposition to land surface should be covered by stormwater SCE
- Airborne deposition to river surface was eliminated as trivial in JSCS
- One except is Schnitzer Steel Site. DEQ has directed SSI to conduct an evaluation airborne contaminant transport to both the river & their neighbors. DEQ/SSI is in formal dispute resolution over this directed action.